

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, the 13th day of March 1923, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. ROBERT DANIEL RICHMOND was sworn in.

II

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner:—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

Representations regarding the Religious Endowments Bill.

865 Q.—Diwan Bahadur GOVINDAS CHATHURBHUJADAS: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state whether all the written representations received in his department regarding the Hindu Religious Endowments Bill will be printed and copies made available to the Members of the Legislative Council before the Bill is taken up for consideration by the Council?

A.—The answer is in the affirmative.*

Moslem representation in menial service of the Judicial department in Ganjām.

866 Q.—Khan Sahib Munshi MUHAMMAD ABDUR RAHMAN SAHIB: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(i) whether it is a fact—

(a) that two Muhammadans are shown as entertained in the Civil Judicial department in Ganjām district as per G.O. No. 658, Public, dated 15th August 1922, embodied in B.P. No. 125, Land Revenue, dated 12th October 1922; and

(b) that the District Judge admitted that the two Muhammadans said to have been appointed to posts in the Judicial department in the Ganjām district in the half-year ending 31st December 1921 were entertained as peons and not as clerks;

(ii) (a) who is responsible for this mistake; and

(b) how the person concerned was dealt with; and

(iii) whether the Government will be pleased to call for information if not available at headquarters?

* Copies of representations have been placed on the Council table.

[13th March 1923]

- 4.—(i) (a) Two Muhammadans were shown as entertained in the return attached to G.O. No. 658, Public, dated 15th August 1922.
- (b) The return in question covered both clerks and peons.
- (ii) (a) The hon. Member appears to be under the impression that the return attached to G.O. No. 658, Public, dated 15th August 1922, was the return ordered in that Government Order to be thereafter submitted. If so, the mistake is his.
- (b) No disciplinary action has been taken.

Moslem representation in the Judicial department in Ganjām on Rs. 30 and above.

867 Q.—Khan Sahib Munshi MUHAMMAD ABDUR RAHMAN SAHIB: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Muhammadans employed in the Civil Judicial department in the years 1921, 1922 and 1923 on posts carrying a salary of Rs. 30 and above in the district of Ganjām;

(b) who is the appointing authority; and

(c) how long the Sarishtadar of the District Court of Ganjām has been occupying that post?

4.—(a) The Government do not consider that the compilation of statistics called for will serve any useful purpose in view of the provisions of the Madras Civil Courts Act, 1873, and the rules thereunder.

(b) The hon. Member is referred to section 23 of the Madras Civil Courts Act, 1873, and the rules framed thereunder published in Home (Judicial) Department Notification No. 760, dated the 9th August 1920, at page 1043 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated the 17th August 1920.

(c) The Government will call for the information.

Nominations to the Chingleput taluk board.

868 Q.—Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) the reasons for nominating certain members of the Vellala community to three out of the six nominated seats in the Chingleput taluk board when that community had already 10 of the 24 elected seats;

(2) whether one Mr. Namakathan Pillai and one Mr. Mannaperumal Pillai, both Adi-Dravidas, were nominated to the said board in succession; what their relative and respective qualifications were; the reasons for the nomination of Mr. Mannaperumal Pillai in preference to Mr. Namakathan Pillai; for the subsequent resignation of Mr. Mannaperumal Pillai, and for the nomination of a Brahman to fill up his place; and

(3) whether petitions and memorials were submitted to Government pressing the claims of the depressed classes for nomination; and with what result?